



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,719	09/30/2004	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0442 (CTX-088)	5718
69665 7590 11/10/2009 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER				
CHIANG, JUNGWON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/10/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,719

Applicant(s)

PANASYUK ET AL.

Examiner

JUNGWON CHANG

Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/1/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to applicant's argument filed on 7/1/09. Claims 1-35 are present for application.
2. Information Disclosure Statement filed on 7/1/09 has been considered.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-35 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-35 of copending Application No. 10/711,646 (hereinafter 646). Although the conflicting claims

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both methods of present application and the 646 application comprise substantially the same elements. The difference between the 646 application and the present application is the claimed "first ticket and second ticket" in the present application, and "ticket" in the 646 application. The claimed "first ticket" is used to represent either first connection or second connection, and the "second ticket" is used to represent either first connection or second connection. Each communication connection is assigned its own ticket (i.e., session ID, key) is well known in the art. Although the 646 application recites only one ticket for communication connections, the ticket can inherently comprise the first ticket and second ticket. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8, 12-26 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine et al, (US 7,089,311), hereinafter Devine, in view of Shimada et al, (US 2002/0143955).

7. As to claims 1 and 18, Devine discloses the invention as claimed, including a method for re-connecting a client to a host service (col. 2, lines 54-65, "reestablishing"), the method comprising:

providing a communication session between a client (60, fig. 2) and a host service (64, fig. 2) via a first connection (58, fig. 2) between the client (60, fig. 2) and a first protocol service (62, fig. 2), and a second connection (54, fig. 2) between the first protocol service (62, fig. 2) and the host service (64, fig. 2);

detecting a disruption in one of the first connection and the second connection (120, fig. 5; col. 6, lines 47-56, "upon the loss of an IP connection 25"), maintaining the other of one of the first connection and the second connection (col. 4, lines 47-67, "preserving a session between an SNA application and a server");

obtaining, at the first protocol service, a ticket (fig. 6, "authenticate certificate for connection"; col. 9, lines 27-33, "prompts the end user to enter a user identification and password"; col. 9, lines 34-47, "re-logon");

validating the ticket to re-establish the disrupted connection, and validating the ticket to continue use of the maintained connection (col. 9, lines 27-33, "once validated..."; col. 3, lines 19-22);

linking the re-established connection to the maintained connection (fig. 5; col. 2, lines 54-65, "reestablishing"; col. 6, lines 56-64).

8. Although Devine discloses a ticket for communication connection and it is obvious and inherent that each communication connection has its own ticket (i.e.,

session ID or authenticate certificate), Devine does not specifically disclose a first ticket and second ticket. Shimada discloses a first ticket and second ticket (Figs. 7, 14, 22; page 4, 0086-0091). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Devine and Shimada because Shimada's tickets would monitor the state of the each connection and determines whether or not the state makes a transition, as taught by Shimada (page 5, 0106).

9. As to claims 2 and 20, Devine discloses, further comprising maintaining the communication session during the disruption in the disrupted connection (col. 4, lines 47-67, "preserving a session between an SNA application and a server").

10. As to claims 3, 19 and 21, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above.

11. As to claims 4 and 22, Devine discloses, further comprising validating, by the ticket authority, at least one of the first ticket and the second ticket (fig. 6; col. 9, lines 27-33, "once validated..."; col. 3, lines 19-22).

12. As to claims 5 and 23, Devine discloses, further comprising authenticating the client to a web server (fig. 6; col. 3, lines 19-22, "client may be authenticated").

13. As to claims 6 and 24, Devine discloses, further comprising transmitting, by a

web server, the first ticket to the client (col. 3, lines 2-22; col. 2, lines 54-65).

14. As to claims 7 and 25, Devine discloses, further comprising transmitting, by the client, the first ticket to the first protocol service (col. 3, lines 2-22; col. 2, lines 54-65).

15. As to claims 8 and 26, Devine discloses, further comprising authenticating, by the host service, the client upon establishment of the communication session (fig. 6; col. 3, lines 19-22, "client may be authenticated").

16. As to claims 12 and 30, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above.

17. As to claims 13 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above.

18. As to claims 14 and 32, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above. In addition, Devine discloses, wherein the re-established connection is linked to the maintained connection after the ticket is validated (fig. 6; col. 4, lines 47-67).

19. As to claims 15 and 33, Devine discloses wherein one of the first connection and the second connection comprises a plurality of connections connected via one of an

intermediary node and one or more first protocol services (fig. 1).

20. As to claims 16 and 34, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above. In addition, Devine discloses, wherein a ticket is generated for at least one of the plurality of connections (fig. 6).

21. As to claims 17 and 35, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 18 above. In addition, Devine discloses, wherein the ticket is valid for the least one of the plurality of connections (col. 9, lines 27-33, "once validated..."; col. 3, lines 19-22).

22. Claims 9-10 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Shimada, Crump et al, (US 6,484,206).

23. As to claims 9-10 and 27-28, Devine does not specifically disclose wherein the first protocol service comprises a proxy server, a security gateway. However, Crump discloses wherein the first protocol service comprises a proxy server, a security gateway (col. 3, lines 42-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Devine and Crump because Crump's teaching would enable communication between the clients and the server, as taught by Crump (col. 3, lines 42-50).

24. Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Shimada, Crump, Jones et al, (US 7,010,300).

25. As to claims 11 and 29, Although Devine discloses the client and the first protocol service communicate using a first protocol, and the first protocol service and the host service communicate using the second protocol (fig. 1; col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 3), Devine does not specifically disclose a first protocol encapsulating a second protocol. Jones discloses a first protocol encapsulating a second protocol (col. 4, lines 43-58; col. 11, lines 51-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Devine and Jones because Jones' teaching would provide ongoing communication session according to the first network protocol over the second network protocol, as taught by Jones, col. 7, lines 3-15.

26. Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

(1) Applicants argue that neither Devine nor Shimada teaches or suggests a first ticket and a second ticket much less validating a ticket "to continue use of the maintained connection."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Devine discloses a ticket (SSL client authentication on a digital X.509 certificate received from the client along with the connection request") for communication connection to continue use of the maintained

connection (col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 35). The examiner notes that the certificate of Devine is equivalent to the claimed ticket. In addition, Shimada discloses a first ticket and a second ticket (page 4, 0086-0091, "session ID"). The session data of Shimada includes as entries a session ID (identifier) for identifying a session, a session search key (destination and source addresses, destination and source ports, and a protocol) for uniquely determining a session, session state that is continually used of the maintained connection (page 4, 0086; page 9, 0157-0160, "obtains the session data whose session ID is 3"). The session ID or session search key of Shimada is equivalent to the claimed ticket.

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JUNGWON CHANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JUNGWON CHANG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454
November 9, 2009